UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/084,712	02/25/2002	Lalitha Agnihotri	US020056	5878

24737 7590 07/11/2006

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER	
WILDER, PETER C	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2623	

DATE MAILED: 07/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/084,712	AGNIHOTRI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Peter C. Wilder	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *23 April 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Note to Applicant

Art Units 2611, 2614 and 2617 have changed to 2623. Please make all future correspondence indicate the new designation 2623.

Double Patenting

Applicant is advised that should claims 11 or 12 be found allowable, claims 18 and 19 respectively will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5, 10, and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ward III et al. (U.S. 6756997 B1).

Referring to claim 1, Ward teaches a method for retrieving information about television programs, said method comprising the steps of:

connecting to a website including information about a television program being watched (Column 18 lines 19-34 teaches connecting to the online chat system);

downloading the information from the website (Column 18 lines 19-34 teaches the connecting to a web site and as part of connecting to a web site information from the site has to be transmitted back to the requestor and subsequently stored);

processing the information (Column 18 lines 19-34 receiving a web site and an online chat occurring through the web site so processing inherently has to be occurring); and

displaying the information along with the television program being watched (Column 18 lines 19-34 teaches displaying the web site/chat and the related television program in a PIP window).

Referring to claim 2, depending on claim 1, Ward teaches the method where the information about the television program is textual information (Column 18 lines 19-34 teaches chatting on the website).

Referring to claim 3, depending on claim 1, Ward teaches the method of where the information about the television program is a particular event (Column 18 lines 19-

34 teaches the chat on the website can be about the game that is playing at the same time).

Referring to claim 4, depending on claim 1, Ward teaches wherein the connecting to the website includes using a mechanism selecting from the group consisting of a tag from an electronic program guide that corresponds to the television program being watched (Column 17 lines 54-65).

Referring to claim 5, depending on claim 1, Ward teaches the method wherein downloading the information from the website includes:

extracting the information from the website (Column 18 lines 19-34 teaches the EPG connecting to a website and displaying the website in a part of the television screen and when a website is contacted the web page/chat window is extracted from the site and transferred to the requesting device); and

transmitting the information over a network (Column 18 lines 19-34 teaches a viewer doing using a chat system on his television from a website related to the program they are watching thus it is inherent that information from the website is transmitted over a network).

Referring to claim 10, Ward teaches a video processing system, comprising:

means for connecting to a website including information about a television program being watched (Column 18 lines 19-34 teaches connecting to the online chat system);

means for downloading the information from the website (Column 18 lines 19-34 teaches the connecting to a web site and as part of connecting to a web site information from the site has to be transmitted back to the requestor and subsequently stored);

means for processing the information (Column 18 lines 19-34 receiving a web site and an online chat occurring through the web site so processing inherently has to be occurring); and,

means for displaying the information along with the television program being watched (Column 18 lines 19-34 teaches displaying the web site/chat and the related television program in a PIP window).

Referring to claim 13, depending on claim 10, see rejection of claim 2.

Referring to claim 14, depending on claim 10, see rejection of claim 3.

Referring to claim 15, depending on claim 10, see rejection of claim 4.

Referring to claim 16, depending on claim 10, see rejection of claim 5.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Klosterman et al. (U.S. 5940073).

Referring to claim 1, Klosterman teaches a method for retrieving information about television programs, said method comprising the steps of:

connecting to a website including information about a television program being watched (Column 9 lines 35-67 teaches connecting to a website related to the television show Seinfeld);

downloading the information from the website (Column 9 lines 35-67 teaches the connecting to a web site and as part of connecting to a website the viewable web page itself is downloaded from the site to the viewers system);

processing the information (Column 9 lines 35-67 teaches receiving a web site and processing has to occur in order to be able to display the downloaded web page on the receiving sites monitor); and

displaying the information along with the television program being watched (Column 9 lines 64-67 teaches being able to view a web page in picture-in-picture with a television program, the television program can be the show Seinfeld).

Referring to claim 10, Klosterman teaches a video processing system, comprising:

means for connecting to a website including information about a television program being watched (Column 9 lines 35-67 teaches connecting to a website related to the television show Seinfeld);

means for downloading the information from the website (Column 9 lines 35-67 teaches the connecting to a web site and as part of connecting to a website the viewable web page itself is downloaded from the site to the viewers system);

means for processing the information (Column 9 lines 35-67 teaches receiving a web site and processing has to occur in order to be able to display the downloaded web page on the receiving sites monitor); and,

means for displaying the information along with the television program being watched (Column 9 lines 64-67 teaches being able to view a web page in picture-in-picture with a television program, the television program can be the show Seinfeld).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ward III et al. (U.S. 6756997 B1) in view of Shoff et al (U.S. 6240555 B1).

Referring to claim 6, depending on claim 1, Ward fails to teach the method of wherein downloading the information from the website includes:

identifying information about events in other episodes similar to an event in the television program being watched;

extracting the information about events in other episodes from the website; and transmitting the information about events in other episodes over a network.

In an analogous art Shoff teaches the method of wherein downloading the information from the website includes:

identifying information about events in other episodes similar to an event in the television program being watched (Column 5 lines 60-64 and Column 11 teaches lines 28-34 teaches facts of other episodes being identified because the data is related to a button the user can select, and Column 7 lines 25-50);

extracting the information about events in other episodes from the website (Column 6 lines 23-48 teaches information coming from websites);

transmitting the information about events in other episodes over a network (Figure 2 and Figure 4 and elements 74 and 82 and Column 4 lines 36-55 teaches the transmission of data).

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to modify the supplemental information method of Ward using the episode information extraction method of Shoff for the purpose of supplying supplemental

information to enhance the traditional way of viewing television (Column 1 lines 32-35, Shoff).

Referring to claim 17, depending on claim 10, see rejection of claim 6.

Claims 7, 11, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ward, III et al. (U.S. 6756997 B1) in view of Ahmad et al. (U.S. 6263507 B1).

Referring to claim 7, depending on claim 1, Ward fails to teach the method of wherein processing the information includes combining summaries of other episodes.

Ahmad teaches the method wherein processing the information includes combining summaries of other episodes (Column 11 lines 32-51 teaches receiving news broadcasts or episodes and Column 21 lines 10-18 teaches news broadcasts/episodes from networks being received; Column 27 lines 40-58 teaches correlating information of other news sources, and Column 23 lines 3-9 and Figure 2B teaches combining the news stories/summaries from different episodes that are similar onto one display).

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to modify the supplemental information method of Ward using the summary combining of Ahmad for the purpose of allowing a body of information to be displayed by electronic devices in a manner that allows the body of information to be reviewed quickly and in a flexible manner (Column 2 lines 60-64Ahmad).

Referring to claim 11, depending on claim 10, see rejection of claim 7.

Referring to claim 18, depending on claim 10, see rejection of claim 7.

Claim 8, 12, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klosterman et al. (U.S. 5940073) in view of Shoff et al (U.S. 6240555 B1) further in view of Ochiai et al. (U.S. 6757482 B2).

Referring to claim 8, depending on claim 1, Klosterman fails to teach the method of wherein processing the information includes combining video clips of events in other episodes similar to an event in the television program being watched.

In an analogous art Shoff teaches a video clip related to the program being watched being retrieved (Column 12 lines 48-67 and Column 13 lines 1-40 (Specifically lines 35-40) teach supplemental content can be a video clip).

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to modify the supplemental information method of Klosterman using the related clip of an episode method of Shoff for the purpose of supplying supplemental information to enhance the traditional way of viewing television (Column 1 lines 32-35, Shoff).

Klosterman and Shoff fail to teach wherein the processing the information includes combining video clips of events in other episodes.

In an analogous art Ochiai teaches processing the information includes combining video clips of events in other episodes (Column 10 lines 16-30 teaches receiving broadcast programs and Column 9 lines 59-67 and Column 10 lines 1-4 teaches extracting scenes and combining the scenes to generate a summarization, Column 9 lines 28-33 teaches the edition device having a processor).

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to modify the combined methods of Klosterman and Schoff using the processing combination method of Ochiai for the purpose of allowing viewers to watch news reports concerning sports transversely out of two or more news programs of different broadcast stations (Column 10 lines 28-31, Ochiai).

Referring to claim 12, depending on claim 10, see rejection of claim 8.

Referring to claim 19, depending on claim 10, see rejection of claim 8.

Claim 9 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. (U.S. 20010018771 A1) in view of Eyer et al. (U.S. 6789106 B2).

Referring to claim 9, Walker teaches a method for retrieving information about television programs (Abstract), said method comprising the steps of:

connecting to a website including information about a television program being watched (Paragraph [0030]);

downloading the information from the website (Paragraph [0030] teaches download audio and visual information and the abstract);

processing the information (Paragraph [0030] teaches processing the related/supplemental information by displaying the video and the information at the same time).

Walker fails to teach storing the information for later playback.

In analogous art Eyer teaches storing the information for later playback (Column 3 lines 16-22 teaches delivering additional content, Column 5 lines 21-28 teaches obtaining content from the Internet, and Column 10 lines 31-36 and 43-46 teaches storing audio/visual content for later retrieval and viewing).

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to modify the additional web content method of Walker using the storage method of Eyer for the purpose of allowing the user to retrieve the content at a later time for viewing (Column 10 lines 43-46).

Referring to claim 20 Walker teaches a video processing system, comprising:

means for connecting to a website including information about a television program being watched (Paragraph [0030]);

means for downloading the information from the website (Paragraph [0030] teaches download audio and visual information and the abstract);

means for processing the information (Paragraph [0030] teaches processing the related/supplemental information by displaying the video and the information at the same time).

Walker fails to teach means for storing the information for later playback.

In analogous art Eyer teaches means for storing the information for later playback (Column 3 lines 16-22 teaches delivering additional content, Column 5 lines 21-28 teaches obtaining content from the Internet, and Column 10 lines 31-36 and 43-46 teaches storing audio/visual content for later retrieval and viewing).

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to modify the additional web content method of Walker using the storage method of Eyer for the purpose of allowing the user to retrieve the content at a later time for viewing (Column 10 lines 43-46).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter C. Wilder whose telephone number is 571-272-2826. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4PM Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Grant can be reached on (571)272-7294. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PW

CHRISTOPHER GRANT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600